IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKAN CENTRAL DIVINISIONS

MICHAEL ROBERTSON

VS.

NO. 4:20 - CV - 1259 LPR - PSH

LT. NICOLE NELSON,

DEP. GREGORY BELT

SGT. MURPHY

DEFENDANTS

## MOTION TO OBJECT OFFENDANTS AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

ANSWER Lobiection

come now Plaintiff MichAEI ROBERTSON, Sui Juris Pursuant to U.M. Universal Declaration OF Human Rights, + For his Obsection to defendant's Answer/Affirmative defenses (DOC.14) state the Following.

- 1. As stated the defendants Answer + Affirmative defenses are Now objected by the Plaintiff.
  - 2. The Plaintiff assert & reserve the right to file a Motion to object or other allropriate Objections & to alledge any of the affirmative defenses made by the defendants which are Frivolous; Malicious & Moot.
    - 3. The Plaintiff specifically + expressly object to each + every one of the defendants answers + Affirmative defenses not made specifically + expressly admitted in this objection.
    - 4. The plaintiff respectfully request that defendants agree to settle out with his claim of \$1,000,000 Dollars under state, Federal + International law. 2.

## OBJECTION TO DEFENSES AFFRMATIVE DEFENSES

5. The Plaintiff assert the following objects objections the adefendants affirmative defenses:

A. In response to defendants defenses in Letter AMB In reference to the 11th Amendment USC. the defendants have no applicable immunity, including tort/negligence immunity Statutory tart/ Neligence immunity, Statutory tart/ Neligence immunity, Punitive Damages immunity & Sovereign Immunity, builified Immunity, being that Defendants are color of law officials that could be liable for their blatant actions under color of law Pursuant to see: U.S. codes of law Title 18 Chapter 241+242.

According with the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitutions Due Process Clause and equal Protection, of the Laws Clause,.